

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-34, 37-40, and 42-47 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11-33, 37-40 have been amended. Exemplary support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification because at page 19, lines 13-25 lack a reference to figure 12(B). Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification at page 19, line 22, to add "as shown in FIG. 12(B)" after "Then," and before "the headline character code data 30". Further, "specifcially" has been replaced with "specifically" in the same paragraph due to an inadvertent typographical error. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

### **Objections to the Claims**

Claims 12, 14-16, 22, 23, 29, and 38 have been objected to because the preamble refers to a program while the parent claim refers to a computer readable medium claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been amended to replace "program" with "computer readable medium" for clarity and consistency.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claims should be withdrawn.

**Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-34, 37-40, and 42-47 have been rejected under 37 C.F.R. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been amended for clarity, as suggested by the Examiner at pages 3-8 of the Office Action.

With regard to claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that "detecting a user selection of a plurality of document blocks that is marked on a scanned document" does not conflict with "the plurality of document blocks being identified by a perimeter and containing a specific image to be processed, the perimeter being established by the user beforehand". More particularly, the first sentence describes the detection of document blocks marked on a scanned document selected by a user. The second sentence describes that the document blocks are identified by a perimeter which is established by the user. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned first and the second sentences do not conflict with one another.

Similarly, with regard to claim 34, Applicants respectfully submit that the perimeter is established by the user *before* the extracting step on an original document using a drawing instrument. Claim 34 simply limits the second sentence discussed hereinabove with regard to claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 does not conflict with claim 33.

**Kurosawa**

While the Examiner has not rejected the present claims over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,954 (hereinafter "Kurosawa"), in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are patentable over Kurosawa. Applicants note that the Examiner's position is that "if the independent claims were amended to clearly claim the user marks the scanned document prior to scanning then Kurosawa's teaching of the user marking the document after scanning will be overcome in a 35 USC102 sense, however, the Examiner will need to reconsider such an amendment under 35 USC 103 in view of *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*" (Office Action, Page 8). Applicants respectfully submit that Kurosawa does not render obvious the pending claims when viewed in light of *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurosawa does not disclose or suggest the features recited in the presently pending claims.

**Conclusion**

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below if any issues remain in this matter, or if a discussion regarding any portion of the application is desired by the Examiner.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge  
our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 16, 2008

By: Shruti S. Costales  
Shruti S. Costales  
Registration No. 56,333

**Customer No. 21839**  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620